FILED KEVIN V. RYAN (CSBN 118321) 1 United States Attorney 05 JUN 30 AM 10: 32 2 EUMI L. CHOI (WVSBN 0722) RICHARD W. WIEKING CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA Chief, Criminal Division 3 DENEE A. DILUIGI (COSBN 35082) 4 Special Assistant United States Attorney 5 450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055 San Francisco, California 94102 6 Telephone: (415) 436-7031 Fax: (415) 436-7234 7 Email: Denee.DiLuigi@usdoj.gov 8 Attorneys for Plaintiff 9 10 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE COURT 11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 12 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION 13 CR 3-05-70262 JL No. 14 STIPULATION CONTINUING DATE OF UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 15 PRELIMINARY HEARING OR ARRAIGNMENT AND EXCLUDING Plaintiff, 16 TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT CALCULATION (18 U.S.C. § 17 v. 3161(h)(8)(A)) AND [PROPOSED] ORDER ZIBU GAO et al (TIFFANY STUART), 18 Defendant. 19 20 On May 24, 2005, the parties in this case appeared before the Court and Ms. Stuart waived 21 her right to a preliminary hearing or arraignment within twenty days of her initial appearance. 22 Based on Ms. Stuart's waiver, the parties scheduled the next appearance in this matter for June 23 30, 2005 at 9:30 a.m. before Judge James for a preliminary hearing or arraignment. 24 The parties request this continuance on the grounds that: (1) the United States has not yet 25 provided all relevant discovery to Mr. Cohen, counsel for Ms. Stuart; (2) Once Mr. Cohen 26 receives the discovery, he will require adequate time to review this discovery and further discuss 27 it with Ms. Stuart; (3) the United States and Mr. Cohen are exchanging information that may 28

have an impact Ms. Stuart's disposition; and (4) Mr. Cohen believes that postponing the preliminary hearing is in Ms. Stuart's best interest, and that it is not in his client's interest for the United States to indict the case before the June 30, 2005 preliminary hearing date. The parties agree that the requested continuance is necessary for continuity of defense counsel and effective preparation of defense counsel.

The parties stipulate and agree that the above-stated reasons constitute good cause to support a continuance under Rule 5.1 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure and 18 U.S.C. § 3060. The parties also stipulate and agree that the stated reasons support a continuance of the preliminary hearing or arraignment date under Title 18, United States Code, Sections 3161(b) and 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv) and that the failure to grant the requested continuance would deny the

defendant continuity of counsel and deny counsel for the defense the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

DATED THE ST. S

Special Assistant United States Attorney

DATED: 6/24/05

JOSH COHEN
Attorney for Ms. Stuart

ORDER

For the foregoing reasons, the Court finds that good cause is shown and concludes that the continuance is proper under Rule 5.1 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure and 18 U.S.C. § 3060.

The Court FURTHER ORDERS that an exclusion of time between May 24, 2005 and June 30, 2005, is warranted under the Speedy Trial Act because a failure to grant the continuance would deny the defendant continuity of counsel and would unreasonably deny defense counsel and the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of

due diligence. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(iv). The Court finds that the ends of justice served by excluding time under the Speedy Trial Act outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial and in the prompt disposition of criminal cases. Id. § 3161(h)(A). The Court, therefore, concludes that this exclusion of time is proper pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). The defendant is HEREBY ORDERED to appear before Judge James on June 30, 2005 at 9:30 a.m. IT IS SO ORDERED. United States Magistrate Judge